

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The application as filed included 20 claims. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were examined. Claim 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,023,684 to Pearson("Pearson"). Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,775 to Eberman et al.("Eberman"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,977 to Douglas ("Douglas"). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman et al. and further in view of (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,279 to Gould et al.("Gould"). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,407 to Ditmer et al.("Ditmer"). Claims 1, 5-7, 12-13, and 17 were objected to for containing the term "voice recognition."

In addition, Figures 3 and 4 were objected to for use of the term "voice recognition."

The abstract was objected to for containing more than 150 words.

The title was objected for not being descriptive.

The specification was objected to for use of the term "voice recognition" rather than "speech recognition."

In the present Amendment, claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended to recite additional limitations of the present invention. Claims 1, 5-7, 12-13, and 17 have additionally been amended to substitute the term "speech recognition" for "voice recognition."

A distinguishing feature of the present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, is a system that permits a user to access legacy data through an interface that is protected by a firewall ("the systems interface comprising a first server for managing protocol and a second server for generating legacy transactions, and a firewall for protecting the first server and the second server"). Support can be found in the originally filed Fig. 2 and the accompanying text in the specification. The system of the present invention facilitates a technician's ability to access legacy system data by providing speech recognition capability to a computer in communication with a systems interface ("wherein the computer is further programmed with a speech recognition application for receiving voice input from a user, and wherein the speech recognition application is adapted to convert the voice input into data recognized by the client application"). The technician can be assured of the quality of the data by the fact that the interface servers are protected from the legacy systems and the user's access computer using a firewall. Thus, the user is provided with a maximum in flexibility in accessing the legacy systems since he can interact using a portable device (computer 100) by voice with the protected interface at any remote point that is capable of linking to the interface.

Pearson teaches a system that provides a customer with access to financial data obtained from back end systems in a financial institution through a user's computer (Figure 2, item 28) that is linked to the internet (Figure 2, item 34). The access to back end systems takes place

through an application server (Figure 2, item 56) that is linked to the customer through either a web server (Figure 2, item 50) or a customer service machine (Figure 2, item 52). As disclosed in Figure 2 of Pearson, the application server 56 that acts through communication server 60 as an interface to the back end servers containing financial data, is not protected by a firewall from the back end servers. Thus, Pearson does not teach or suggest, as taught in claim 1 of the present invention, a system for accessing legacy data through an interface, wherein the interface is protected by a firewall from a legacy system.

Although Eberman teaches a speech recognition process (Figure 3, items 150, 160, 161, and 100) for interacting with software applications, Eberman does not teach a systems interface to legacy systems, "the systems interface comprising a first server for managing protocol and a second server for generating legacy transactions, and a firewall for protecting the first server and the second server." Therefore, Pearson and Eberman do not, whether taken singly or in combination, teach or fairly suggest the invention of the current application as recited in claim 1.

Claim 7, as amended, recites a system for remotely accessing data including "means for providing an interface to a plurality of legacy systems, wherein the means for providing an interface includes at least one firewall that protects the means for providing an interface from the legacy systems." Similarly, amended claim 12 recites a system for remotely accessing legacy data that includes a "systems interface in communication with the plurality of legacy systems, wherein the systems interface in protected from the legacy systems by a firewall." For the reasons detailed above, neither Pearson or Eberman teach or fairly suggest the current invention as claimed in claims 7 and 12.

As amended, claim 16 recites a method for allowing a user to access data that includes "receiving voice inputs from the user". In contrast, Pearson teaches a system where voice inputs may be sent *to* a user. In column 1, lines 28-32 of Pearson, a user may access systems through voice response units that provide voice input *to* the user. Accordingly, Pearson does not teach the limitation of the present invention as taught in claim 16, wherein inputs are received *from* a user.

Accordingly, upon entry of the present Amendment, independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, at least for their dependence on allowable claims, the remaining dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

Additionally, inasmuch as the specification and drawings have been amended as detailed above, the application is believed to be in allowable condition.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900


Date: May 27, 2004

PCC/RAR/lrhj

Customer No. 28970

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN G. SMITH, ET AL.

By:   
Poh C. Chua  
Registration No. 44,615

2/4




FIG. 2



3/4




FIG. 3

4/4




FIG. 4